

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**BRENDA EDWARDS,**

**Plaintiff,**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 08-CV-12146-DT**

**VS.**

**DISTRICT JUDGE JULIAN ABELE COOK**

**STANDARD FEDERAL BANK, MAGISTRATE JUDGE MONA K. MAJZOUN  
NA, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

---

**OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE  
AND FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on the Motion to Strike filed by Defendants Standard Federal Bank, ABN AMRO, and Lasalle Bank on August 27, 2008 and the Motion for Protective Order filed on the same date by the same Defendants. (Docket nos. 25, 26). In addition, Defendants Trott and Trott, MacKay, and King filed a Notice of Joinder in the above motions on September 9, 2008. (Docket no. 32). Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and failed to file a written Response to either of these motions. The Court held a hearing on these motions on October 27, 2008. Plaintiff appeared at the hearing, and the Court heard her argument against granting Defendants' motions. These motions have been referred to the undersigned for decision. (Docket no. 33). These motions are now ready for ruling.

Plaintiff stated at the October 27 hearing that she opposed the granting of these motions but failed to offer any specific reasons or authority in support of her positions. Rule 12(f), Fed. R. Civ. P., allows the Court to strike documents that are redundant, impertinent, or scandalous. Defendants move to strike Plaintiff's "Requests for return of deposited money." (Docket nos. 16-21). These

“requests” have no basis in law or fact and are impertinent. Therefore, Defendants’ Motion to Strike will be granted.

Defendants also seek a protective order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) to stay discovery. Plaintiff has apparently not served proper discovery upon Defendants but has filed documents containing questions which for the most part seek irrelevant information. (Docket no. 22). Requiring Defendants to respond to these requests at this time would be unduly burdensome. There are pending motions to dismiss filed by Defendants which may end this action. (Docket nos. 8, 9). For these reasons, Defendants Motion for Protective Order will be granted.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion to Strike (docket no. 25) is **GRANTED** and that docket numbers 16-21 are stricken from the record.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion for Protective Order (docket no. 26) is **GRANTED** and that discovery is stayed in this action until Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss (docket nos. 8, 9) are ruled upon.

#### **NOTICE TO THE PARTIES**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), the parties have a period of ten days from the date of this Order within which to file any written appeal to the District Judge as may be permissible under 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1).

Dated: October 29, 2008

s/ Mona K. Majzoub  
MONA K. MAJZOUB  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of this Opinion and Order was served upon Brenda Edwards and Counsel of Record on this date.

Dated: October 29, 2008

s/ Lisa C. Bartlett  
Courtroom Deputy